

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 of the present application have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-26, 30 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147726 to Yehia ("Yehia").

Additionally, claims 8, 18, 29 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yehia in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120917 to Abrari et al. Finally, claims 27 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yehia in view of United States Patent No. 6,560,608 to Tomm et al. Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 19 in order to more distinctly claim the subject matter that is deemed to be the present invention. Additionally, a substitute Abstract is submitted to overcome the objection of the Examiner to the length of the Abstract.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-26, 30 and 32 based on Yehia, applicants respectfully disagree with the position of the Examiner. Yehia teaches a system for the management of orders and contracts between trading partners using a hub and spoke system. The system tracks orders against contracts and notifies or reminds trading partners of critical events and activities including important dates, compliance and violations of the contractual terms. (paragraphs 0075-0078). This is quite different from the present invention which is aimed at a system for automatically generating message validation and transformation software from rules input by a user using a structured editor. In Yehia, documents are contract templates built using data type definitions, XML schemas and/or XML documents. Documents are sent over the network to a central hub where certain elements are parsed from the documents for analysis by a rules analysis engine. (Yehia, paragraph 0084). The purpose of the central hub in Yehia is to analyze the orders of various members and analyze the order to insure they are in compliance with the contractual commitments of the various parties. The system of the present invention is significantly different in that the goal is to transform messages from a format used by one party (party A) to another format used by another party (party B). Once transformed the message can be sent to party B and the system of party B can implement the request in the message without additional processing.

Yehia does not teach this type of automatic generation of message validation and message transformation software from message definitions and business rules input with a structured editor. In Yehia, contracts and orders are in a format that can be parsed and data can be extracted for use by a rules engine. The rules engine executes a set of rules based on the terms

of the contract and generates warnings to the user if contract terms are not being met. This is not the purpose of the present system. In the present system, validation and transformation software is developed from business rules that describe the message format needs of the parties. Yehia related to enforcement of contract terms, the present invention relates to the enforcement and transformation of message structure and format. While some of the activity in Yehia could be viewed as "message" validation, i.e., the enforcement of contract formats, nothing in Yehia teaches or suggests the generation of message validation and transformation software from a set of rules input using a structured editor. This step has been inserted into claim 1 from claim 3 and into claim 19 from claim 20 to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The Examiner stated that paragraph 0094 of Yehia teaches the generation of message transformation software from the set of business rules. Applicants contend that this paragraph teaches only the use of an action processor that performs a certain action in the presence of a specific condition. For example, an e-mail message might be sent to a party if it is in violation of a contract provision. This does not teach or suggest the generation of message validation and transformation software.

Similarly with respect to claim 19, applicants submit that Yehia neither teaches nor suggests the use of a system having a structured editor for inputting a set of message definitions, data dictionary entries and business rules that can be used to automatically generate message validation and message transformation software.

Applicants contend that dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-17 are dependent from novel and non-obvious independent claim 1 and dependent claims 20-26 and 30 and 32 are dependent from novel and non-obvious independent claim 19.

Additionally, with respect to claim 15 applicants submit that paragraph 0145 of Yehia does not teach or suggest the transferring of pre-existing word processing formatted business rule documents into structured files particularly as set forth explicitly in the steps of claim 17. The word processing formatted documents in Yehia are contract templates that are used to enter into contracts between companies and do not represent a pre-existing database of business rules related to the validation and transformation of messages from one format to another.

With respect to claims 8, 18, 29, and 31 the Examiner cites United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0120917 to Abrari ("Abrari") as overcoming certain deficiencies in the primary Yehia reference. More specifically, the Examiner cites Abrari as teaching the use of an editor for editing structured files in a tabular format citing FIGS. 6-17. Applicants submit that Abrari does not overcome the deficiency of Yehia in that Abrari does not teach or suggest the use

of a structured editor to input business rules for the purposes of automatically generating message validation and message transformation software used to validate and transform messages from a first format to a second format.

Furthermore with respect to claim 18, the Examiner cites Abrari as teaching the step of generating a set of test cases to provide test messages with which to test the message transformation and validation software citing paragraphs 0011, 0047 and 0042. Applicants submit that although testing is mentioned there is no discussion of generating a set of test messages.

Regarding claim 29, the Examiner recognized that Yehia fails to teach a project interface to access all of the structured files citing paragraphs 0042, 0043 and 0046 of Abrari. Applicants submit that these paragraphs do not teach or suggest such a project interface but rather are concerned with the business rule input device.

Regarding claim 31, the Examiner recognized that Yehia fails to teach a document generator to develop user-readable documentation pertaining to the message definition interface and business rules citing paragraph 0042 of Abrari. Applicants submit that Abrari does not overcome the primary deficiency of Yehia in that a system for the automatic generation of message transformation software is neither taught nor suggested by either.

Finally, claims 27 and 28 have been rejected by the Examiner as obvious in view of Yehia and United States Patent No. 5,560,608 to Tomm. With regard to claim 27, the Examiner states that Yehia fails to explicitly teach the generation of an index listing of elements used in a definition and that Tomm overcomes this deficiency through its teaching in FIG. 4 and col. 4, lines 23-50. Applicants submit that Tomm does not overcome the deficiency of the primary reference in that Yehia and/or Tomm neither teach nor suggest a system for the automatic generation of message validation and transformation software from a set of message definitions and business rules input using a structured editor.

Regarding claim 28, the Examiner recognized that Yehia fails to teach the use of a data dictionary capable of providing changes pertaining only to the interface definitions stating that Tomm overcomes this deficiency in column 5, lines 25-42. Applicants submit that this section of column 5 describes the method of selecting a mapping rule using an auto-mapping process and does not teach or suggest the pruning of the data dictionary claimed in claim 28.

Applicants respectfully suggest that all independent claims, as amended, are allowable and all dependent claims depending therefrom are also allowable. Applicants hereby request

Appl. No. 10/823,157
Amdt. Dated March 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

APP 1556

reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4-19 and 21-32, in view of the above amendments and discussion,
and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

A one-month extension of time is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Telcordia Technologies, Inc.

By William A. Schoneman
William A. Schoneman
Reg. No. 38,047
Tel.: (732) 699-3050